



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/394,379	09/10/1999	KYOUNG SUB KIM	008733-D7151	4146

30827 7590 01/27/2003

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

QI, ZHI QIANG

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2871

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/394,379

Examiner

Mike Qi

Applicant(s)

KIM, KYOUNG SUB

Art Unit

2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 24 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-8, 10-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant admitted prior art in view of US 5,739,880 (Suzuki et al).

Claims 1 and 15, Applicant admitted prior art discloses (page 2, line 24 – page 4, line 20; Figs.1-2 of the specification) a liquid crystal display device having light source (20) and comprising:

- a first substrate (4);
- a second substrate (6) having first and second surfaces (upper and lower surfaces), wherein the first surface (upper surface) is disposed against the first substrate (4);
- a sheet material (10) disposed between the light source (20) and the second substrate (6), and at least a portion of one edge of the sheet material (10) is not directly under the black matrix (26) (as the non-transparent film), wherein the black pattern (24) is installed to overlay with the black matrix (26).

Applicant admitted prior art does not expressly disclose a non-transparent film coated on periphery of the second surface (lower surface) of the second substrate.

Applicant admitted prior art discloses a black pattern (24) (non-transparent film) is

printed on the left edge of the protective sheet (10a) and it is on the lower surface of the second substrate (6).

However, Suzuki discloses (col.12, line 28 – col.15, line 51; Figs.2-9) that a liquid crystal display device having a shield tape (TAPE) is stuck to the lower face of the lower substrate (SUB1) at the portion in which the seal member (SL) and the black matrix (BM) are not overlapped, and the shield tape (TAPE) is preferable black, and the shielding means is a shielding coating film, so as to prevent the leakage of the back light (BLL). The shield tape (TAPE) is along the seal member (SL) (see Figs. 2 and 9), such that the shield tape (TAPE) is coated on the periphery of the lower face of the lower substrate to block the light emitted from the light source.

Suzuki indicates (col.15, lines 3-11) that the shield tape (TAPE) is stuck to the outside of the substrate (SUB1), and the light (BLL) emitted from the back light is interrupted at the portion other than the display region by the black matrix (BM) and the shield tape (TAPE), so that a color liquid crystal display element having an excellent display quality.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art to use a non-transparent black film coated on periphery of the lower surface of the lower substrate as claimed in claims 1 and 15 for preventing the light leakage from the back light and achieving an excellent display quality.

Claims 2 and 16, Applicant admitted prior art discloses (Fig.1-2) that the black matrix (26) (non-transparent material) is formed in the periphery portion and is formed on the lower surface (second surface) of the upper substrate (4) (first substrate).

Claims 3 and 17, the black matrix (non-transparent material) is formed on the upper surface (first surface) of the lower substrate (second substrate) would have been at least an obvious variation according to the different application to improve the display contrast.

Claims 6 and 20, see the explanation of Suzuki above, Suzuki discloses (Fig.9) that the shield tape (TAPE) (non-transparent film) and the black matrix (BM) (non-transparent material) are partially overlapping throughout the periphery of the lower substrate (SUB1) (second substrate), so as to block the light leakage from the back light (BLL).

Claim 10, Applicant admitted prior art (Figs.1-2) discloses that a sheet material (10) includes a protective sheet (10a), a prism sheet (10b) and a diffusion sheet (10c) and disposed between the light source (20) and the second substrate (6).

Claim 11, Applicant admitted prior art discloses (Fig.1-2) that the black matrix (BM) (non-transparent material) is formed in the periphery portion and is formed on the lower surface (second surface) of the upper substrate (4) (first substrate).

Claim 12, see the explanation of Suzuki above, Suzuki discloses (Fig.9) that the shield tape (TAPE) (non-transparent film) and the black matrix (BM) (non-transparent material) are partially overlapping throughout the periphery of the lower substrate (SUB1) (second substrate), so as to block the light leakage from the back light (BLL).

Claims 4-5, 7-8,13-14,18-19, 21-22, Applicant admitted prior art (Figs.1-2) the non-transparent is a black matrix (26); the non-transparent film is a black pattern (24) (black film).

Claim 23, Applicant admitted prior art discloses (page 4, lines 3-5 of the specification) that the black pattern (24) (black film) is printed. Suzuki discloses (col.15, lines 49-51) that the shielding means (black film) is a shielding coating film. Therefore, it would have been at least obvious to make a black film using printing process or coating process.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claim 24 is allowed.
4. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art of record neither discloses nor teaches a liquid crystal display device comprising various elements as claimed, more specifically, as the following:

a sheet material disposed between the light source and the second substrate, and the sheet material comprising an uppermost sub-layer (the protective sheet) having a first length and at least one underlying ~~sub~~^{sub}-layer (the prism sheet and the diffusion sheet) having a second length, wherein the first length is substantially equal to the second length [claim 24].

The closest references Applicant admitted prior art and US 5,739,880 (Suzuki et al) disclose a structure of a liquid crystal device having a sheet material between the light source and a substrate and the sheet material comprising protective sheet, prism sheet and diffusion sheet, but the prior art of record do not show the protective sheet, the prism sheet and the diffusion sheet having same length as claimed in claim 24.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on Jul.8, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's **only** arguments are as follows:

1) The references do not teach or suggest the limitation included in the independent claims 1 and 15, such as "a sheet material disposed between the light source and the second substrate, wherein at least a portion of one edge of the sheet material is not directly under the non-transparent film", and there is no motivation in the reference Suzuki.

Examiner's responses to the Applicant's **only** arguments are as follows:

1) The Applicant admitted prior art discloses (page 3, line 14 – page 4, line 20; Figs.1-2 of the specification) that a liquid crystal display device in which a sheet material (10) disposed between the light source (20) and the second substrate (6), and at least a portion of one edge of the sheet material (10) ^{there is a protective sheet 10a} (such as the protective sheet 10a) is not directly under the black patten (24) (as a non-transparent film, see the Fig.1 left edge of the protective sheet (10a)) or it also can be read as at least a portion of one edge of the sheet material (10) (such as the protective sheet 10a) is not directly under the black matrix (26) (as a non-transparent film, see the Fig.1 left edge of the protective sheet 10a), because there is a black patten (24) between the black matrix (26) and a portion of the protective sheet (10a), that is a portion of the protective sheet (10a) not directly under the black matrix (26) (also is a non-transparent film). The claims do not

describe the specific size and the specific position of the protective sheet, the prism sheet and the diffusion sheet. The reference Suzuki indicates (col.15, lines 3-11; lines 60-63) that the shield tape (TAPE) is stuck to the outside of the substrate (SUB1), and the light (BLL) emitted from the back light is interrupted at the portion other than the display region by the black matrix (BM) and the shield tape (TAPE), so that a color liquid crystal display element having an excellent display quality, moreover, preventing the light leakage at the seal portion, and that would be a motivation.


Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mike Qi whose telephone number is (703) 308-6213. The examiner can normally be reached on 349.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Mike Qi
January 13, 2003


ROBERT H. KIM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2200